

MYP Design standardisation sample: Welcome to Phnom Penh

Moderator Assessment

Criterion	A	B	C	D
Level achieved	6	6	6	6

Overall MYP grade: 6

Assessment Criterion A: Inquiring and analysing

This work achieved a level **6** because the student:

- Explains the need for a solution to the problem clearly and specifies the Ministry of tourism as the client and tourists as the target audience.
- Constructs a research plan which both identifies and prioritises primary and secondary research needed, e.g.
 - Primary: Interviews with ministry of tourism, travel agents, advertising companies, tourists, hotels,
 - Secondary: Internet, books, newspaper, Nat Geo magazines, billboards, tourist magazines, television.
- Analyses a range of existing display booths from a variety of countries and from this identifies positive aspects that could be incorporated into their design.
- Develops a basic design brief, which states the findings of relevant research

The student would have achieved a higher level if he/she had:

- Justified the need for solving this problem fully. The justification is weak and not explained fully.
- Included a summary of all of the useful data that was found from the research, e.g. quoting/paraphrasing requirements from the interviews conducted, linking directly to the research identified and sources used.

Assessment Criterion B: Developing ideas

This work achieved a level **6** because the student:

- Develops design specifications which outline the success criteria for the design of the solution
- Develops feasible designs, using a variety of drawing perspective and effective annotation, which allows them to be interpreted.
- Presents the chosen design and justifies fully and critically its selection with detailed reference to the design specification
- Created planning drawings/diagrams for the chosen solution.

The student would have achieved a higher level if he/she had:

- Included further justification of the design specifications which are drawn from the analysis of the research.
- Developed the ideas further. All design ideas were similar and there was little evidence of development. The student could have developed particular elements individually.
- Developed clear, accurate planning drawings, which also indicated how the parts were to be assembled

Assessment Criterion C: Creating the solution

This work achieved a level **6** because the student:

- Constructs a logical plan which considers time and resources, sufficient for peers to be able to follow to create the solution
- Demonstrates satisfactory technical skills when making the solution
- Follows the plan to create the solution which functions as intended and is presented appropriately
- Describes changes made to the chosen design and plan when making the solution

The student would have achieved a higher level if he/she had:

- Presented a plan in a more logical way, which made it easier to follow. Timelines are not clear enough to follow to create the solution. This would have benefitted from a different presentation and supporting images (e.g. an assembly drawing)
- Demonstrated a more advanced level of technical skill. The level of technical skill required to create the product was not high.
- Justifies the changes. The justification was limited and more explanation of why these changes were made is required.

Assessment Criterion D: Evaluating

This work achieved a level **6** because the student:

- Designs a relevant testing method, which generates data, to measure the success of the solution
- explains the success of the solution against the design specification based on relevant product testing
- describes how the solution could be improved
- explains the impact of the product on the client/target audience.

The student would have achieved a higher level if he/she had:

- Designed a range of testing methods to test against each design specification. Understanding that testing was limited as it was a model and not the full-size booth, it was difficult to collect objective data.
- Critically evaluated the success of the solution against the design specification based on authentic product testing. Data collection and analysis could have been stronger by summarizing data and provided a more detailed explanation of survey results. Also, the amount of data collected was limited to only a few tourists and family and friends. More robust quantitative data would have provided for a more convincing argument regarding the success of his/her product. This would enable them to present a more critical argument regarding whether their product was successful or not.
- Explains how the solution could be improved. Further detail of how the changes could improve the product is required. Also, the lack of critical evaluation resulted in few improvements being identified.